

REMARKS

Claims 7-77 are pending in the application. Claim 10 has been amended. No new matter has been added.

The only outstanding rejection is of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Mulyuga (Chem. Abstr. 74:13698). The rejection is traversed.

The cited Mulyuga abstract only reports certain five N,N'-disubstituted compounds each having two phenyl groups which are either unsubstituted or substituted by methoxy, bromo or fluoro.

Those reported compounds are insufficient to sustain the instant rejection. Much greater structural similarity has been required to establish a *prima facie* case under Section 103. See, for example, *In re Grabiak*, 226 USPQ 872, where the Federal Circuit reversed a §103 rejection on the basis that the prior art provided no suggestion to replace oxygen (in an ester of the cited prior art compound) with a sulfur (to provide the thioester of the claimed compound).

The Mulyuga document also clearly does not provide any suggestion of Applicants' claimed methods of treatment.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

G. Durant et al.
U.S.S.N. 09/176,067
Page 56

Respectfully submitted,



Peter F. Corless (Reg. No. 38,360)
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
Telephone: 617 439 4444